

REMARKS

Claims 1-69 are pending in the above-identified application.

In the Office Action, Claims 1-69 were rejected.

With this Amendment, Claims 1 – 5, 8 – 12 – 18, 24 – 26, 28 – 30, 38, 39, 43, 45, 53 – 54, 58, and 68 – 69 were amended, and Claims 2 and 23 was cancelled.

Accordingly, Claims 1, 3 –, 22, 24 – 69 are now at issue.

I. Objection of Claims

The Examiner objected to Claims 1, 9, 10, 16 – 18, 25, 43, 53 – 54, and 68 – 69 because of informalities. Applicants have appropriately corrected the claims at issue, except for Claims 9 and 10 which recite “wherein” instead of “comprising”.

Accordingly, Claims 1, 12, 15 – 18, 25, 43, 45, 53 – 54, and 68 – 69 have been amended to remove the claim objections. Applicants respectfully request that these claim objections be withdrawn.

II. 35 U.S.C. § 102 Anticipation Rejection of Claims

Claims 1-6, 8-13, 15-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Maekawa (U.S. Patent 5,663,953).

Although Applicants respectfully traverse these claim rejections, Claim 1 has been amended to remove any ambiguities that may have been at the basis of these rejections, and to clarify the invention.

Claim 1 is directed to a communication control apparatus, which comprises a request processing unit and a communication control unit. Claim 1 recites “a request processing unit for inquiring to a designated communication apparatus whether it intends to attend multipoint communication when receiving information designating that communication apparatus and a request seeking the attendance of that designated communication apparatus in the multipoint communication.”

Claim 1 has been amended by incorporating the limitations of Claim 6. As amended,

Claim 1 recites “for sending information necessary for the designated communication apparatus to attend the multipoint communication to the designated communication apparatus.”

The Examiner indicates that Maekawa teaches the limitations of Claim 6, and points to FIG. 2, namely steps S2 and S6, for support. However, Maekawa discloses in relation to Steps S2 and S6, in column 5, lines 11-17), that:

“In step S2, all the pieces of personal information of the members of the group registered by the telephone directory managing unit 14b are copied to a non-response group in the storage unit 14a. At this point, all the pieces of personal information of the four members shown in Table 1 above are registered in the non-response group.”

And, in column 6, lines 5 – 10, that:

“If it is determined in step S5 that the data indicates participation, the flow advances to step S6, and the telephone directory managing unit 14b moves the personal information of the responding member registered in the non-response group in the storage unit 14a to a participation group in the storage unit 14a.”

Thus, Maekawa is only concerned with registering “all the pieces of personal information of the members”, i.e., personal information about the designated communication apparatus, and is silent about the information communicated to the designated communication apparatus that is necessary for the designated communication apparatus to attend the multipoint communication.

Accordingly, Maekawa fails to anticipate Claim 1.

Claim 13 has been amended by incorporating relevant limitations of Claim 14, similar to the claim 6 limitations discussed above, to distinguish Claim 13 from Maekawa.

Claim 18 has been amended by incorporating the limitations of Claim 23, similar to the claim 6 limitations discussed above, to distinguish Claim 13 from Maekawa.

Claim 26 has been amended, by adding limitations analogous to those of Claim 6, to recite “a routine for sending information necessary for the designated communication apparatus to attend the multipoint communication to the designated communication apparatus.”

Thus, Claims 1, 13, 18, and 26 are allowable over Maekawa, as are their respective dependent claims for at least the same reasons.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that these claim rejections pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 102 be withdrawn.

III. 35 U.S.C. § 103 Obviousness Rejection of Claims 7 and 14

Claims 7 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maekawa (U.S. Patent 5,663,953) in view of Dinwiddle (U.S. Patent 6,415,269). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 7 and 14 are directly or indirectly dependent on Claims 1 and 13, which were shown above to be allowable over Maekawa. Thus, Maekawa and Dinwiddle may not properly be combined to reject Claims 1 and 13.

Accordingly, Claims 7 and 14 are allowable over Maekawa in view of Dinwiddle. Applicants respectfully request that these claim rejections pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 103 be withdrawn.

IV. 35 U.S.C. § 103 Obviousness Rejection of Claims 28 - 68

Claims 28-69 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maekawa (U.S. Patent 5,663,953) in view of Kenichi (JP 11272577). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 28 has been to recite “a transmitting unit for transmitting information necessary to attend the multipoint communication about the multipoint communication to the users extracted by the user extracting unit.” Thus, Claim 28 recites the distinguishing limitation of amended Claim 1.

Claims 43 and 58 have been amended to recite “a step of transmitting information necessary to attend the multipoint communication about the multipoint communication to the extracted user.” Thus, Claims 43 and 58 recite an analogous limitation to that of the amended Claim 1.

Based on the above anticipation discussion, Claim 1 is allowable over Maekawa in view of Kenichi, thus Claims 28, 43 and 58 are also allowable over Maekawa in view of Kenichi. Their respective dependent claims are also allowable for at least the same reasons.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that these claim rejections pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 103 be withdrawn.

III. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that Claims 1, 3 – 22, 24 – 69 are clearly allowable over the cited prior art, and respectfully requests early and favorable notification to that effect.

Dated: April 10 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By: David R. Metzger

David R. Metzger
Registration No. 32,919
SONNENSCHNEIN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP
P.O. Box 061080
Wacker Drive Station, Sears Tower
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1080
(312) 876-8000